

### Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 68-84, 88, and 120-125 are currently pending, of which claims 68 and 125 are independent. By this paper, Applicants have amended claims 68 and 75 and added new claim 125. Support for the claim amendments and new claim can be found in the application as originally-filed. Thus, no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 68-84, 88, and 120-124 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,605,343 to Motoi et al.<sup>1</sup> Applicants submit that Motoi et al. fails to teach or suggest salient features of Applicants' invention, as previously recited in independent claim 68, and, therefore, respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 68 to amplify the distinctions between Applicants' claimed invention and Motoi et al. In particular, Applicants submit that Motoi et al. fails to teach or suggest a method comprising, inter alia, a step of "applying a non-foaming thermosetting-resin-precursor mixture to the web material so as to impregnate the web material," as independent claim 68 recites. Applicants note that during prosecution of the parent of the present application (U.S. Patent Application No. 10/125,573, now U.S. Patent No.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action appears to include a typographical error in citing to Motoi et al. as U.S. Patent No. 6,635,343. Also, while the Office Action states that claims 68-84 and 88-124 were rejected based on Motoi et al., claims 89-119 were canceled in the Amendment and Response to Restriction Requirement filed October 17, 2007.

6,972,144), the Examiner agreed that a similar feature of Applicants' invention claimed therein was not taught or suggested by Motoi et al.

As for new independent claim 125, Applicants submit that Motoi et al. fails to teach or suggest steps of scoring a laminate to form creases, and folding the laminate into a sleeve-like configuration, as claim 125 recites.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Motoi et al. fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent claims 68 and 125. Accordingly, those claims should be deemed allowable over Motoi et al.

Dependent claims 69-84, 88, and 120-124 also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of Applicants' invention in addition to those recited in independent claim 68. Further individual consideration of all of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

\* \* \*

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached in the Washington, D.C. office of Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper & Scinto by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

---

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.  
Registration No. 60,081  
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1983514v1